Report - DD2520 - 2024-06-17

Respondents: 1
Answer Count: 1
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):

Daniel Bosk <dbosk@kth.se>

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS
Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

Course survey (LEQ 6). Also through studienämnden.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS
Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

I've asked the students to continuously report to me if they have any suggestions. Had a meeting with studienämnden.

COURSE DESIGN
Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

No significant changes were made (slight clarifications of the Canvas room). New course responsible dived into the course to make better informed changes.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD
Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If these is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

Most seem to need 12-14 h/week instead of the 20 h/week that the credits suggest.

THE STUDENTS' RESULTS
How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

The results are quite OK:

11 A
12 B
1 C
13 E
15 F

The Fs are due to students not doing the mandatory assignments, not that they failed.

STUDENTS´ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS
What does students say in response to the open questions?

See https://github.com/OpenSecEd/appliedcrypto/issues/73

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS
Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

There are only minor issues with the course. The most urgent were the following:

INL1Quiz was the worst part. It had some confusing questions.

The TAs might have graded a bit too strictly. INL1Oral was different depending on the examiner. Should be more consistent.

OVERALL IMPRESSION
Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

Overall it was a good offering. Considering that students spent 13-14 h/week instead of 20 h/week, we can conclude that the reason they didn't finished on time were rather due to other courses.

ANALYSIS
Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:
- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

The international students reported slightly lower on fair assessment. I have nothing concrete as to why. My only speculation is that it might be due to expectations on how grading systems should work (specifications grading vs 50% on the exam for E).

Otherwise the grading of the assignments can be made clearer. It should also be revised so that it's more balanced and reflects the learning outcomes and the grading criteria for them. ("Too easy to get an A.")

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT
What aspects of the course should be developed primaily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

Realign the assignments with the learning outcomes and the grading criteria. This will affect the grading rubrics for the assignments, which should be synced with the TAs. This would also contribute to clarifying why the students should have the seminars.

Revise INL1Quiz. Maybe make it of more formative nature, with one part after each lecture. That includes adding feedback to the questions so that the students can learn, and know what they need to learn more.

From the teachers' perspective: Revise what the students learn and are expected to learn in each lecture. For instance, turns out that we don't cover protocol design to a great enough extent. In essence, we teach small pieces here and there, but the students are left to piece it together mostly on their own. We should do that part better.

We should also discuss post-quantum crypto and how that affects practice to a larger extent. But otherwise the theory of that is probably better suited for the Foundations of Crypto course.